

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-5, and 10-12 are presently pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Claims 1, 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over (USPN 6,219,126) to *Von Gutfeld* in view of (USPN 5,427,858) to *Nakamura et al.* Claims 5, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over *Von Gutfeld* in view of (USPN 5,263,888) to *Ishihara et al.* and *Nakamura et al.* Applicant traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action admits that *Von Gutfeld* and/or *Ishihara et al.* “does not disclose the method wherein the protrusion is formed of indium-tin-oxidized (ITO) or metal.” Nonetheless, the Office Action asserts that “Nakamura et al. discloses that organic insulating films such as silicone rubber and indium-tin-oxide (a material containing metal) are interchangeable in the image display art (see column 10, lines 35-52).” Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action’s assertion is not commensurate with teachings of the applied art. The cited portions of *Nakamura et al.* relate only to an electrode material and not the image display art as a whole. Also, the claimed feature in question is not an electrode but a protrusion. That is, the cited portions of *Nakamura et al.* -- which only relate to an electrode -- are alleged to teach the claimed features of a protrusion, a barrier fillet, or the like. Here, it is respectfully noted that the Office Action has not provided any evidence any teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the references themselves or in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to make a protrusion of a same material as an electrode.

Moreover, *Nakamura et al.* teaches that “[t]hat the electrode material can be selected from electrically conductive metals.” Within the long list of exemplary electrically conductive materials, *Nakamura et al.* discloses one option for the electrode material of “silicone rubber and silver” (i.e., silicone rubber with silver coated thereon to provide electrical conductivity) and another option of ITO. In contrast, all embodiments of the barrier fillet 3 of *Von Gutfeld* -- which the Office Action alleges to be a “protrusion” as claimed -- are electrically insulating materials and lack electrical conductivity. In *Von Gutfeld*, the silicone rubber is not provided with a silver coating and, therefore, is electrically insulating. Thus, it cannot be concluded that electrically insulating silicone rubber and electrically conductive ITO are “interchangeable” as alleged by the Office Action. Instead, the fact that *Von Gutfeld* only discloses electrically insulating materials and that the cited portion of *Nakamura et al.* requires electrically conducting materials would, if anything, teach away from the “interchangeability” alleged by the Office Action.

Thus, the continued rationale for obviousness and the citation of case law in the Office Action is based on flawed initial conclusions. Applicant respectfully submits that the *Nakamura et al.* provides no teaching or suggestion to modify the device of *Von Gutfeld* to achieve the claimed invention. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

As stated in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed November 12, 2004, Applicant respectfully asserts that the use of ITO and metal are particularly advantageous because production can be made more efficient if the protrusion can be formed by the same

processes and at the same time as the LCD cell structures on the plate. Applicant further asserts that this is an aspect recognized by the inventors and not recognized in the prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Date: March 22, 2005

By:



Robert J. Goodell

Reg. No. 41,040

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20004-2541

202-739-3000 (Phone)

202-739-3001 (Fax)